

requería aplicar calor, para fijar los colores a la pared, por lo que se terminaron por fundir y mezclar los pigmentos; dejando

Miguel Ángel fue el primer artista que consiguió hacer una gran fortuna con su trabajo. Está considerado como uno de los mayores genios de la historia (al igual que Leonardo), y consiguió ser reconocido por su trabajo. Las bellas artes dejaron de ser trabajos de artesanía y la fama del artista, así como su individualidad precede su trabajo. la obra en un estado pésimo. ●

### Bibliografía

FREUD, SIGMUND: "Un recuerdo infantil de Leonardo da Vinci" (1910)

VASARI, GIORGIO: "Vida de los más excelentes pintores, escultores y arquitectos.....", Cátedra, 2005

VALLEJO-NÁJERA, JUAN ANTONIO: "Locos egregios", Barcelona, Planeta Agostini, 1996

VOLTÉS, PEDRO: "El reverso de la Historia", Circulo de Lectores, 1993

## Implicaturas Conversacionales

**Título:** Implicaturas Conversacionales. **Target:** Carrera de Filología. **Asigantura:** Pragmática. **Autor:** M<sup>a</sup>Carmen García-Saúco Montesinos, Licenciada en Filología Inglesa.

In the following paper, I am going to make a study of how Conversational Implicatures are used in the famous television series "The Simpsons", in order to create the criticism of the American society, which is shown in the series. I will analyse exhaustively one dialogue that represents a topic of criticism and the process that is created when a Conversational Implicature occurs. The author I am based on is Paul Grice, who was the one that stated the Conversational Implicature theory. He also established the Cooperative Principle in which he describes how people interact between themselves. In this principle he says that people supposedly try and throughout speaking in a conversation reach a good communication. This Cooperative Principle is made up by four Maxims, which are Quantity (use in the conversation the correct amount of information), Quality (say something true), Relation (be relevant) and Manner (be clear and perspicuous) also established by Paul Grice. They are principles that enable an effective communication. When this maxims are not fulfilled, are broken, not followed or are "flouted" (in pragmatic terms) an extra meaning appears. This additional information makes a Conversational Implicature. The idea that is created in the hearer when the implicature is made is called Inference. Which happens when the hearer is obliged to think about what the speaker was thinking about when saying the Implicature.

## EXPOSITION OF HYPOTHESIS

As I have said before, in the first place, I am trying to prove the use of Implicatures in the series, that by using them, the creators make the criticism of the American society that characterises “The Simpsons”. There are many topics dealt within the series, they are criticised throughout visual images and language uses. I want to study the pragmatic Conversational Implicatures used. I will analyse an Implicature which will be a sentence, that criticises one topic situated in a short conversation of an episode. In the second place, I want to prove if the Maxims of Quantity and Manner are the ones most flouted. I think this because the members of the Simpsons family usually do what they want to, and they like to be very independent. They also are very close to each other, so they talk very much between them. In order to have this behaviour this two Maxims are quite used. They use an ambiguous language, which represents the Maxim of Manner and representing the Maxim of Quantity, they do not really give enough information of what they are going to do. First, I will analyse one conversation with an Implicature in it. It will be a sentence that represents the message of criticism. Which is one of the aims of my study. Secondly I will analyse in a very brief way tow more conversations that have also this characteristics in order to support my hypothesis in a further way.

## EXHAUSTIVE ANALYSIS OF TEXT A & BRIEF ANALYSIS OF TEXTS B AND C

In TEXT A (appendix), the conversation I am going to examine belongs to the first episode of the thirteenth season of the series. Its title is “Lisa the treehugger”. This episode is a criticism towards the government and the rich businessmen in the way that they only want money and they do not take care of environment matters. To summarize it, Lisa Simpson, the eldest daughter of the Simpsons family goes to live on top of the biggest sequoia of Springfield. The reason is because she gets to know that it is being putting up for auction between the richest businessmen of Springfield, that want to cut it down to use the territory left. In this specific moment of the episode, the Simpsons family go to the “Krusty Burger”, which is a place where you can only eat hamburgers. It is called “Krusty” because the person who finances it is a clown, whose name is Krusty. When they reach there “Marge”, the Simpsons’ family mother, sees at the Krusty Burger’s roof some people dressed with costumes as if they were cows, so she tells the others. They have a big poster which has -Krusty Burger = Earth Murder- written on it. They are protesting because of the huge amount of cows that have to be killed to create the hamburgers that are made there. When “Homer”, the Simpsons’ family father, sees the poster he thinks about the situation. At this point knowing the context, we will start with Grice’s Cooperative Principle which is not taking place. The reason is because the information Homer is giving to his family is not clear and is not enough. We presuppose that, as a speaker, he has tried to communicate well but he has not managed it. So here, as the Cooperative Principle has not been well done, the maxims that compose it have not been followed and the Implicature has occurred. I will now analyse divided in two parts, the Maxims flouted in the sentence, first <I knew this day would come> and second <The cows are taking back what's theirs!>.

In the first place, the Maxims that Homer is flouting when he says <I knew this day would come> are the Maxims of Quantity and Relevance. Quantity, because Homer, the speaker is not giving enough information, he says that a certain day has come. He does not say what day is it, as for example “3rd March 2005” and does not say the reason why he knew that that day would come. Throughout it he tells his family that he had already thought about it, he is in the day he had thought

about, he says it in <I knew>. Also Relevance is flouted because the family is not talking about specific days or dates, so it is not relevant to say something about a day. At this point, the Implicature takes place. Marge, Lisa and Bart (Simpsons' son) could think the following. Since the context of the situation and as they know him, they could think that as he loves eating hamburgers and he has not got a great intellectual coefficient, maybe at some point he could have thought that the cows could rebel asking for their meat. This is the message the creators of the series want to transmit, the Implicature or additional meaning. When the members of his family started to think why he had said that phrase, an Inference took place inside of Lisa's, Bart's and Marge's head. The different possible ideas why Homer had given such an importance to that day.

In the second place, when saying again Homer <The cows are taking back what's theirs!> the Maxims of Quantity and Manner are being flouted. Quantity because he does not say what they are taking, the establishment's money, the establishment, etc. Throughout saying <what's theirs!> a clue is given, which is that what they have come to get is something related to cows. When Homer says, <taking back> is not following the Maxim of Manner because it is very ambiguous, therefore two possible understandings exist. One, that human beings have taken the cows something of their property and they have come to get it and second, that cows are taking something of their property because they want to. Without having humans taken anything from them, in other words without revenge. So now, the Implicature that the Simpsons family can think about is that again, knowing his feelings and taking into account where they are, (in a hamburger establishment) Homer Simpson was thinking about the meat with which the hamburgers are made, that comes from the cows rebelled. The process that continues is the one of Inference which has been created when the rest of the family have thought what ideas Homer would have had in mind in order to say that. The cows taking something, which the clue was their meat.

In TEXT B (appendix), the Maxims flouted are first Quantity because Moe (the bar owner) is saying that Barney said "it", but what is "it"? we lack information. Second, the Maxim of Quality because Barney was babbling, he did not say anything so Moe lacks evidence when supporting Barney's idea because he said nothing. Finally the third, the Maxim of Manner because the "it" in <you said it, Barn> is ambiguous, we don't know what he said. So throughout the Implicature the scriptwriters of the series are trying to criticise the pejorative treatment that Americans have towards immigrants, because Moe is supporting Barney's idea without having said anything, only because of being American. The prejudice is towards the immigrants. As it is shown in the dialogue, the American people do not know how to speak their own language well but as they are Americans it does not matter, while if they are immigrants they are greatly criticised. The Inference is the idea that created to rest of the crowd that was in the bar of what Barney was saying and what he was referring to. If he supported immigrants or not.

In TEXT C (appendix), the Maxim flouted is Quantity because Shary Bobbins is not giving enough information and is trying to say that she does not want to sing anymore, which is the Implicature. The Inference has taken place when the children thought she did not wanted to sing them more. The creators of the series are making a parody of the film "Mary Poppins". They are imitating the nanny of the film in an exaggerated way so people laugh at it. They do it throughout the Implicature.

## DISCUSSION

Having the results of the previous text analysed in depth, were the Maxims of Quantity and Manner are flouted, we now have to add the Maxims of the two more conversations which are on the appendix and that have been also analysed in a shorter way. At this point, if we sum up the number of Implicatures flouted in the three Simpsons television series conversations, there are seven flouted Maxims. Four were Quantity Maxims, two Manner Maxims and one Quality Maxim. Throughout this results I can prove and support perfectly my hypothesis. I stated that the Maxims I thought that were going to be mostly flouted were the ones of Quantity and Manner, so I was correct. The producers have used the Maxim of Quantity mostly, the reason is that when lacking information (because they lack it, they do not say too much, which is also the Maxim of Quantity) they are trying to make the spectator think that what the character who is speaking is going to say it may be bad because it is not clearly said. Something is being hidden, so it implies that it is bad. The character doesn't want the rest of the family know what they have in mind, the action that they are going to do. In order to do this, they use mainly this Maxim. This is the technique used by them to make the criticism. The study I was also trying to prove is that Conversational Implicatures are very often used in the series to criticise various topics. I chose three different episodes that criticised very outstanding themes, the three of them had a sample of my investigation. So I can say again that my hypothesis has been satisfactorily proved.

## CONCLUSION

I have to say that this little study does not mean that in every single episode of the series, an Implicature appears in order to criticise something. This paper only means that Implicatures are usually used because I selected three conversations and the three of them had a topic of criticism hidden in an Implicature. But obviously they not always appear in the episodes. To finish with, I have had some problems when deciding the topic I was going to investigate. Now, I am very satisfied of the paper on the whole, of my decision on studying the Conversational Implicatures in the Simpsons television series, of my data, my results and of course, on having supported well my hypothesis. It has been very interesting for me making this study because I love the series and I could have never thought of what was hidden in it, such as the Conversational Implicatures and its criticism.

## APPENDIX

(The implicatures analysed are underlined and in red)

### Text A: Criticism on not taking care of the environment

- Season: thirteenth
- Episode: first
- Title: Lisa the tree hugger

*The Simpsons arrive at Krusty Burger and get out of the car.*

Marge: Oh, how cute! Kids, look who's on the roof! [people dressed as cows]

Homer: I knew this day would come. The cows are taking back what's theirs!

Lisa: **No, I think they're protesters.**

### **Text B: Criticism on the pejorative treatment towards immigration**

- Season: third
- Episode: twentieth
- Title: Much Apu about nothing

*At Moe's Tavern, Moe and the barflies put up signs.*

Moe: You know what really aggravates me? It's them immigants. They

wants all the benefits of living in Springfield, but they ain't

even bother to learn themselves the language.

Homer: Hey, those are exactly my sentimonies.

Barney: [babbles]

Moe: **Yeah, you said it Barn.**

### **Text C: Parodies on films: Mary Poppins**

- Season: Third
- Episode: Third
- Title: "Simpsoncalifragilisticxpiala-D'oh-cious"

Homer: Come to bed, Marge!

Marge: [amorously] Wooo.

[starts to remove the umbrella]

Homer: No, no. Leave it in.

[they giggle and go upstairs]

*The three children are preparing for sleep.*

Shary: It's 8:00, children.

Lisa: But we're not sleepy.

Bart: Sing us a song, Shary Bobbins.

Lisa: Yes, sing us a song.

Shary: **I've been singing you songs all day.**

●

#### Bibliografía

Cutting, Joan, 2nd ed. 2008: Pragmatics and discourse. New York: Routledge

Implicatures: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Implicature>

Cooperative principle: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cooperative\\_principle](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cooperative_principle)

Gricean maxims: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gricean\\_maxims](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gricean_maxims)

Soledad Pérez de Ayala's class notes: Pragmatics, discourse and text I. 5th year. English Philology

## Estudio sobre Robert Lowell y su poema " The Quaker Graveyard in Nantucket"

**Título:** Estudio sobre Robert Lowell y su poema " The Quaker Graveyard in Nantucket". **Target:** Profesores y alumnos de Literatura Inglesa. **Asignatura:** Literatura de Estados Unidos. **Autor:** M<sup>a</sup>Carmen García-Saúco Montesinos, Licenciada en Filología Inglesa.

**R**obert Lowell, cuyo nombre completo es Robert Trail Spence Lowell Jr, nació en 1917 y muere en 1977, fue un poeta conocido por ser el fundador de la poesía Confesionalista estadounidense. Perteneció al movimiento modernista, el cual se conoce en líneas generales por la literatura vanguardista en lengua inglesa, la cual vio su apogeo entre 1900 y 1940. El modernismo se desarrolló principalmente en Europa, por lo que muchos escritores estadounidenses se trasladaron a Londres o París que eran en ese momento las cunas de la cultura artística. Es un movimiento influido por las vanguardias continentales y por el deseo de ruptura con la herencia victoriana, por lo que en términos generales, se engloba bajo el término "modernista" a toda la producción literaria de escritores norteamericanos y del Reino Unido de la primera mitad del siglo XX.